

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action¹, the Examiner took the following actions:

- (a) rejected claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter;
- (b) rejected claims 5, 8, 9, 22, 23, and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,850 to Scanlan ("*Scanlan*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,247,580 to Kimura et al. ("*Kimura*");
- (c) rejected claims 1, 19-21, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,028,514 to Lemelson et al. ("*Lemelson*");
- (d) rejected claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of *Lemelson* and U.S. Patent No. 5,612,869 to Letzt et al. ("*Letzt*");
- (e) rejected claims 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,663 to Ueda ("*Ueda*");

¹ The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

- (f) rejected claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,300 to Ushioda et al. ("*Ushioda*");
- (g) rejected claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,571 to Pertrushin ("*Pertrushin*");
- (h) rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of Lazzari, "The VI Framework Program in Europe: Some Thoughts about Speech Translation Research," 2002 ("*Lazzari*"); and
- (i) rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,055 to Okunishi ("*Okunishi*").

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 27, and 30. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-32 and are pending and under current examination.

I. Rejection of claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claims 30-32 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter, alleging that claim 30 recites a "'program' per se" (Final Office Action at p. 6). Amended claim 30 recites a statutory computer-readable storage medium, storing computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, implement a

method. Claims 31 and 32 were rejected solely due to their dependence from claim 30 (Final Office Action at p. 7), and are therefore statutory due to their dependence from statutory claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

II. Rejection of claims 1 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scanlan in view of Kimura, and further in view of Lemelson

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 26. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. Such an analysis should be made explicit and cannot be premised upon mere conclusory statements. M.P.E.P. § 2142, 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (September 2007). "A conclusion of obviousness requires that the reference(s) relied upon be enabling in that it put the public in possession of the claimed invention." M.P.E.P. § 2145. "[T]he framework for objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966). . . . The factual inquiries . . . [include determining the scope and content of the prior art and] . . . [a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2141(II). "Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art." M.P.E.P. § 2141(III). A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been

established because the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are not properly supported by a clear articulation of why the claimed invention would have been obvious.

Claim 1 recites a communication support apparatus comprising, for example:

a first determination unit configured to determine a level of importance of the source-language information selected from more than two levels of importance;

Scanlan, *Kimura*, and *Lemelson* do not teach or suggest at least this element.

The Examiner concedes that “*Scanlan* does not specifically suggest judging varying levels of increasing importance.” (Final Office Action at p. 4). However, the Examiner alleges that *Kimura* cures this deficiency of *Scanlan* because “*Kimura* teaches the ability to determine varying degrees of keyword importance.” (Final Office Action at p. 4). This is incorrect. *Kimura* merely discloses determining whether a voice command is an important operation or not. (Figure 10, reference S17; column 9, lines 9-40). Therefore, *Kimura* teaches only one possible level of importance, not varying levels of increased importance.

The Examiner relies on *Lemelson* as allegedly disclosing “the concept of detecting words in a language input associated with emergency situations.” (Final Office Action at page 4). Similarly to *Kimura*, *Lemelson* teaches only one possible level of emergency. (column 14, lines 41-42). Therefore, *Lemelson* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* discussed above because the cited references do not teach or suggest at least “a first determination unit configured to determine a level of importance of the source-language information selected from more than two levels of importance,” as recited in claim 1.

As set forth above, *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, and *Lemelson* do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Moreover, there is no teaching in the references which would motivate one of ordinary skill to modify the disclosures to achieve the claimed combination. Thus, the Final Office Action has failed to clearly articulate a reason why the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art and has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Dependent claim 26, while of different scope, recites elements similar to those of claim 1 and is thus allowable over *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, and *Lemelson* for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

III. Rejection of claims 5, 8, 9, 22, 23, and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 8, 9, 22, 23, and 27-32. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claim 5 recites a communication support apparatus comprising, for example:

a first determination unit configured to determine a level of importance of the source-language information selected from more than two levels of importance;

Scanlan and *Kimura* do not teach or suggest at least this element.

Because *Scanlan* does not teach judging varying levels of increasing importance, as conceded by the Examiner with respect to claim 1, *Scanlan* does not disclose or suggest “determin[ing] a level of importance of the source-language information selected from more than two levels of importance,” as recited in claim 5. As discussed

above, *Kimura* also teaches one possible level of importance and, therefore, fails to cure the deficiency of *Scanlan*.

As set forth above, the Final Office Action has not properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and Applicants' claims. Thus, the Final Office Action has not clearly articulated a reason why the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art and has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 5.

Independent claims 27 and 30, while of different scope, recite elements similar to those of claim 5 and are thus allowable over *Scanlan* and *Kimura* for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5. Claims 8, 9, 22, and 23 depend from claim 5, claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 27, and claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 30. These dependent claims therefore include all of the elements recited in their respective parent claims. Accordingly, claims 8, 9, 22, 23, 28, 29, 31, and 32 are allowable over *Scanlan* and *Kimura* at least due to their dependence from claims 5, 27, and 30.

IV. Rejection of Claims 19-21, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of *Lemelson*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 19-21 and 26. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claims 19-21 and 26 depend from claim 5. Therefore, claims 19-21 and 26 include all of the elements recited in claim 5. As discussed above, *Scanlan* and *Kimura*

fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claim 5 and required by claims 19-21 and 26.

The Examiner relies on *Lemelson* for allegedly teaching several elements recited in claims 19-21 and 26. (Final Office Action at pp. 15-16). Even assuming these allegations are correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Lemelson* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* discussed above. Because neither *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, nor *Lemelson*, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element required by dependent claims 19-21 and 26, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 19-21 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

V. Rejection of claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of *Lemelson* and *Letzt*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 4, 14, and 15. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 5. *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, and *Lemelson* fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5.

The Examiner relies on *Letzt* for allegedly teaching “increasing an alarm if the user fails to respond” and providing, as stimulation, “at least one of light stimulation, sound stimulation, physical stimulation caused by a physical movement, and electrical

stimulation.” (Final Office Action at pp. 16-17). Even assuming this is correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Letzt* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, and *Lemelson* discussed above. Because neither *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, *Lemelson*, nor *Letzt*, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element required by claims 3, 4, 14, and 15, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

VI. Rejection of claims 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of *Ueda*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7 and 10. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claims 7 and 10 depend from claim 5. Therefore, claims 7 and 10 include all of the elements recited in claim 5. As discussed above, *Scanlan* and *Kimura* fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claim 5 and required by claims 7 and 10.

The Examiner concedes that “*Scanlan* in view of *Kimura* does not explicitly teach storing word importance scores.” The Examiner then relies on *Ueda* for allegedly teaching “a language processing technique that stores word importance scores.” (Final Office Action at p. 17). Firstly, *Ueda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* discussed above with respect to claim 5. Second, *Ueda* discloses storing only word importance scores of words used in the documents under analysis, not “score[s] corresponding to each important keyword of the first language,” as recited in claim 7.

(column 11, lines 61-64). Therefore, *Ueda* does not cure any of the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* with respect to claim 7.

As set forth above, the Final Office Action has not properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and Applicants' claims. Thus, the Final Office Action has not clearly articulated a reason why the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art and has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 7. Claim 10, by virtue of being dependent from claim 7, includes all the elements recited in claim 7 and is therefore also allowable over *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, and *Ueda*.

VII. Rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scanlan* in view of *Kimura*, and further in view of *Ushioda*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 11-13. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 5. *Scanlan* and *Kimura* fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claims 11-13 for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5.

The Examiner relies on *Ushioda* for allegedly teaching "associating a possible input keyword with multiple synonyms, each having a weighting score." (Final Office Action at p. 18). Even assuming this allegation is correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Ushioda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* discussed above. Because neither *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, nor *Ushioda*, taken alone or in combination, teach or

suggest each and every element required by claims 11-13, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

VIII. Rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scanlan in view of Kimura, and further in view of Pertrushin

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 16-18. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claims 16-18 depend from claim 5. Therefore, claims 16-18 include all of the elements recited in claim 5. As discussed above, *Scanlan* and *Kimura* fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claim 5 and required by claims 16-18.

The Examiner relies on *Pertrushin* for allegedly teaching several elements recited in claims 16-18. (Final Office Action at pp. 19-20). Even assuming these allegations are correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Pertrushin* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* discussed above. Because neither *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, nor *Pertrushin*, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element required by dependent claims 16-18, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

IX. Rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scanlan in view of Kimura, and further in view of Lazzari

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 24. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the claim.

Claim 24 depends from claim 5. *Scanlan* and *Kimura* fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claim 24 for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5.

The Examiner relies on *Lazzari* for allegedly illustrating that “the use of speech synthesis processing is well known in translation systems.” (Final Office Action at p. 20). Even assuming this allegation is correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Lazzari* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* discussed above. Because neither *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, nor *Lazzari*, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element required by claim 24, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

X. Rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scanlan in view of Kimura, and further in view of Okunishi

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 25. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the claim.

Claim 25 depends from claim 5. Therefore, claim 25 includes all of the elements recited in claim 5. As discussed above, *Scanlan* and *Kimura* fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claim 5 and required by claim 25.

The Examiner relies on *Okunishi* for allegedly teaching "a method for determining if a translation is provided or performed based on particular levels of word importance." (Final Office Action at p. 21). Even assuming this allegation is correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Okunishi* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Scanlan* and *Kimura* discussed above. Because neither *Scanlan*, *Kimura*, nor *Okunishi*, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element required by dependent claim 25, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

XI. Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P

Dated: June 26, 2008

By:  *Anthony J. Lonsardi*
Reg. No. 53,232
Richard V. Burgujian
for Reg. No. 31,744